



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,185	01/27/2006	Hisashi Koga	L8612.05147	5556
52989 7590 10/16/2008 DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC 1901 L STREET NW SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER VILLECCO, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/566,185

Applicant(s)

KOGA, HISASHI

Examiner

JOHN M. VILLECCO

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-22 and 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 10, 13, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - On page 2, line 16, applicant refers to the reference number 22c as the “microphone detection means”. It is clear from Figure 2 that the microphone detection means is reference number 20c. It appears that reference number 22c should be called the external sensor detection means as shown in Figure 2.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 17 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 17 is dependent upon itself.
 - In line 4 of claim 23, applicant recites the phrase "a driver, diving the imaging section". This appears to be a typographical error of the word "diving". It is assumed that applicant meant to use the word -- driving --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2622

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 9, 10, 13, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the operation request determinant" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 10 is rejected based on its dependency to claim 9.

8. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the operation stop request" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 23 recites the limitation "the other signal" in lines 26 and 28. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, applicant recites the limitation of "a specific code" in line 9, and "a code" in line 18, and "the same code" in lines 26 and 30. It is not clear if the "specific code" claimed in line 9 is the same as the codes from lines 18, 26, and 30.

11. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the display information generator" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the code determining means" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the operation request determination means" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 9, 10, 23 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 9, the primary reason for indication of allowable subject matter is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest an identification information determinant, determining a specific identification information in response to a request from a client terminal via a network, a camera operation screen generator, generating camera operation screen information including the identification information for operation on the client terminal, and a determination means which, when the imaging section drive request signal is received from the client terminal, determines whether the identification information matching registered identification information is included in the imaging section drive request signal, and instructs the imaging controller to start operation in accordance with the imaging section drive request signal in case the identification information matching the registered identification information is included in the imaging section drive request signal, and rejects the drive request signal in case the identification information matching the registered identification information is not included.

As for claim 23, the primary reason for indication of allowable subject matter is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a code determinant, determining a specific code in response to a request from the client terminal via a network; a camera operation screen generator, generating camera operation screen information for operation on a client; a code register,

Art Unit: 2622

registering to a memory a code attached to a signal transmitted using the camera operation screen from the client terminal after the camera operation screen information has been transmitted to the client terminal; the operation request determinant which, when another signal is received while the imaging section drive means is operating in accordance with a signal from a client terminal, determines whether the same code as that registered to the memory is included in the other signal; and a controller, based on determination that the same code as that registered to the memory is included in the other signal, the determination made by the operation request determinant, drives the imaging section driver in accordance with the other signal and rejects the signal in case it is determined that the same code as that registered to the memory is included.

16. Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-22, and 25 are allowed.

17. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 1, the primary reason for allowance is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a camera unit, when a first signal is received from the client terminal, transmits an identification information to the client terminal; and the camera unit, when a second signal including the identification information is received from the client terminal, works in accordance with the second signal on a priority basis for a predetermined period after receiving the second signal.

As for claim 11, the primary reason for allowance is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a method, when a first signal is received from the client terminal, determines an identification information to be transmitted to the client terminal and transmits identification information including the identification information to the client terminal together with camera

operation screen information; and the method, when a second signal to which the identification information is attached is received from the client terminal, exclusively works in accordance with the second signal including the same identification information as the identification information on a priority basis for a predetermined period after receipt of the second signal.

With regard to claim 14, the primary reason for allowance is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a method, when a camera operation screen request signal is received from the client terminal, determines an identification information to be transmitted to the client terminal and transmits identification information indicating the identification information to the client terminal together with camera operation screen information, wherein the method, when a camera operation signal to which identification information is attached is received from the client terminal, registers the identification information to a memory and starts operation in accordance with the camera operation signal, and wherein the method, when a camera operation signal is received from the client terminal, operates in accordance with the camera operation signal in case the identification information matching the matching the registered identification information is included in the camera operation signal, and rejects the camera operation signal in case identification information matching the registered identification information is not included.

Regarding claim 16, the primary reason for allowance is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a code determinant, in response to a camera operation screen request issued by a first client terminal, determines "Code 1" and transmits to the first client terminal the camera operation screen information to which the "Code 1" is attached, wherein the code determinant, in response to a camera operation screen request issued by a second client terminal, determines "Code 2" and transmits to the second client terminal the camera operation screen

information to which the "Code 2" is attached, wherein the method, in response to a camera operation signal to which "Code 1" is attached transmitted from the first client terminal by way of a camera operation instruction on the camera operation screen of the first client terminal, sets the first client terminal to the exclusive operation state as well as registers "Code 1" to a memory in association with the first client terminal and starts operation in accordance with the camera operation signal, and wherein the method, in response to a camera operation signal to which code information is attached from a client terminal which is placed in the exclusive operation state, checks whether the code information transmitted together with the camera operation signal matches a code registered to the memory and operates in accordance with the camera operation signal only in case there is a match.

As for claim 18, the primary reason for allowance is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest a camera unit capable of driving an imaging section based on a signal from a client terminal, the camera unit comprising a controller which, receiving a camera operation screen request signal from the client terminal, determines a code to be transmitted to the client terminal and transmits the code to the client terminal together with camera operation screen information, which, when a camera operation screen signal to which the code is attached is received from the client terminal, operates in accordance with the camera operation signal as well as registers to a memory the code transmitted together with the camera operation signal, and which, when another camera operation screen signal is received within a predetermined period, determines that the other camera operation screen signal does not include a code registered to the memory and makes controls so as to reject the other camera operation screen signal.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. VILLECCO whose telephone number is (571)272-7319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN M. VILLECCO/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622
October 13, 2008